

### REMARKS

The above amendments and following remarks are submitted in response to the First Office Action of the Examiner mailed February 26, 2004. Having addressed all objections and grounds of rejection, claims 1-20, being all the pending claims, are now deemed in condition for allowance. Entry of these amendments and reconsideration to that end is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to claim 11, noting a particular informality. In response thereto, claim 11 has been amended above. Claim 1 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, in view of a typographical error. Claim 1 has also been amended to remove this informality.

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,330,630, issued to Bell (hereinafter referred to as "Bell"). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons provided below.

MPEP 2131 provides the standard for a finding of anticipation. It provides in pertinent part:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Bell does not anticipate claims 1-20, because it does not "expressly or inherently describe" "each and every element as set forth in the claim[s]". As a result, the rejection of claims 1-20 is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, claim 1 requires a "first component" and a "second component" each of which being coupled to a "first data bus" and a "second data bus". This configuration is detailed in Applicant's Figs. 5-7 and discussed in the specification at pages 9-7.

Bell does not describe this configuration. Furthermore, the Examiner noticeably has not applied Bell to the claimed configuration. Instead, the Examiner cites Fig. 1 of Bell which shows that buses 90A and 90B are not both coupled to the same two components. In fact hard disc drive (HDD) 93 and network interface card (NIC) 95 are both coupled to bus 90A. Neither is coupled to bus 90B. If Bell is actually applied to the claim language, it is clear that one must reach the conclusion that these limitations are not present in Bell.

Nevertheless, the Examiner has attempted to apply Bell to the limitation of the "circuit" which can combine the two physical busses into a single logical bus. In doing so, he makes maximum use of Bell, column 5, lines 16-19, which he cites numerous times. This citation actually states:

In addition, each bus expander bridge 80 can also be configured to combine multiple PCI buses to provide a single PCI bus having increased bandwidth (sic).

Applicants respectfully submit that this simple statement does not meet the requirement of MPEP 2131 for anticipation which requires the claim limitations to be "either expressly or inherently described".

Having been unable to meet the limitations of the pending independent claims, it is axiomatic that Bell cannot meet the combinations of the dependent claims.

In response to the Examiner's rejection, claims 5, 15, and 20 have been amended to provide a data rate not found in Bell. Therefore, these claims are deemed to be independently patentable.

Having thus responded to each objection and ground of rejection, Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment and allowance of claims 1-20, as amended, being the only pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Lloyd E. Thorsbakken et al.

By their attorney,

Date May 25, 2004



John L. Rooney  
Reg. No. 28,898  
Suite 401

Broadway Place East  
3433 Broadway Street N.E.  
Minneapolis, Minnesota  
55413  
(612) 331-1464